

# APA in a Period of Transformation and a Role for the Policy and Planning Board

## 2017 Annual Report of the Policy and Planning Board

### INTRODUCTION AND HISTORY

The Bylaws of the American Psychological Association (APA) requires the Policy and Planning Board (P&P) to report yearly to the membership regarding matters pertaining to the health of the Association. This begins a two-part, two-year report on policy-making and functioning in the APA and the distinctive role of the Policy and Planning Board (P&P) vis-à-vis policy development and implementation.

This first part, P&P's 2017 annual report, will consider P&P as a tool of APA governance designed to advance the APA's mission and monitor its overall health. Within this larger context, this report will examine the history and purpose of the Policy and Planning Board from its establishment in the Bylaws in 1945, its entirely unique place in the organizational chart reporting directly to the APA Council of Representatives (CoR), to the Board of Directors (BoD), and to the general membership. Its future within a changing APA is a focus of this report.

APA has a number of governance boards and committees, each with a limited focus and purpose and charged with advising and reporting the BoD and/or to CoR. Each contributes to the health and functioning of whole. In contrast, the Policy and Planning Board is charged with viewing APA as a whole in its role as a major scientific and professional organization. Further, P&P examines APA and the scientific and professional context it occupies globally.

Thus, this first report reviews current critical initiatives and challenges as they affect the entire APA. Doing so is meant both to provide observations, advice, and recommendations to APA and its members and to demonstrate the intended and distinctive role and value of P&P as a governance body in monitoring the overall health of the organization and the discipline.

The second part of the report, to be completed as P&P's 2018 Annual Report, will continue the themes of policy development in APA. Importantly, it will present the results of a two-year, self-study during which P&P will evaluate the extent to which it has succeeded in its prescribed mission, including "hits and misses" since its inception and identify opportunities for improvement. It will offer its self-evaluation as a structural model for other boards and committees to follow when they are called on by themselves or by the APA bylaws to carry out their own self-study.

### APA'S ON-GOING TRANSFORMATION: 2017'S VIEW

In August 2010, APA initiated a plan to transform how we govern ourselves and how we respond to scientific and professional developments both within APA and in the nation and world at large. The blueprint for the changes was developed over a period of years and has resulted in several structural modifications each requiring membership approval of amendments to the Bylaws. (*P&P has reported on the Good Governance Project (GGP) and the Implementation Work Group (IWG) in earlier reports; <http://apa.org/about/governance/bdcmte/policy-board.aspx>).* The general membership has already approved amendments to the Bylaws, recommended by the GGP, that have changed important governance structures. For example, the BoD was expanded to include a public member appointed by the BoD and moved election of the members-at-large from the CoR to the general membership. The CoR members authorized a Trial Delegation of its authority for financial decision-making exclusively to the BoD for a period of three years beginning in 2014. The Trial Delegation also provided that the CoR would become exclusively a policymaking body concentrating its time and creative energies on policies that impact the field of psychology in all its branches. Until the delegation, the BoD had operated as the Executive Committee of the CoR. The trial period was meant to afford the BoD and the CoR with the opportunity to exercise and evaluate the effectiveness of the delegations. It was understood that at the end of the trial period in 2017 CoR would vote to revoke the delegation or send to the membership a proposal to amend the Bylaws making the delegation permanent. In 2017, however, the three-year period was extended for an additional three years while the APA addressed the challenges presented by the Independent Report.

What has yet to be resolved are the composition of the membership of the CoR, the evaluation of the Trial Delegation's effectiveness (currently in progress), and final disposition of the Trial Delegation. These changes are historic and meant to have an enabling impact on APA's self-management and its ability to meet its mission as a major scientific organization contributing to the advancement of public health and well-being nationally and globally.

The influence of the *Independent Review Relating to APA Ethics Guidelines, National Security Interrogations, and Torture in 2015*,

often referred to as the Hoffman Report after its principal author, resulted in further changes both to governance and to staff (See *2016 Report of P&P*; <http://apa.org/about/governance/bdcmte/2016-policy-report.pdf>). Summarizing briefly, the CoR responded to the findings of the IR by appointing several working groups, e.g., the APA Commission on Ethics Processes, a task force on human rights and another on civility, to make recommendations that address the flaws and faults identified in the IR. The BoD took responsive action with terminations and resignations of key executive staff it deemed responsible for, or contributing to, the IR's conclusions. Among these changes were the dismissal or departures of the CEO, the Deputy CEO, the Director of the Ethics Office, and the Director of Membership Communications. Cynthia Belar, former Executive Director of the Education Directorate, was hired as the Interim CEO with a charge to conduct a search for a new CEO. Arthur Evans, PhD accepted a contract as the new CEO in 2017, and is now in the process of replacing other vacancies of senior staff. At the time of this writing, this includes the executive directors of the Science, Practice, and Public Interest Directorates. It is the opinion of P&P that APA will continue to react to further consequences of the IR, not the least of which is the resolution of lawsuits to address the grievances from APA members and former staff unfavorably affected by the IR.

Of major importance, APA has recently constituted a new task force of experts in psychology and ethics to review and revise the Code of Ethics. While occurring in the wake of the IR, the revision was overdue for an update. A task force has been appointed and the revision process will begin in 2018.

Internally, APA staff is initiating measures to respond to shifting pressures with initiatives, some radical, all necessary. For instance, membership composition and needs remain in flux. In response, the Membership Office, under the direction of Ian King, is having a favorable impact on membership retention. In keeping with the mandate to develop a strategic plan every five years, our new CEO, Arthur Evans, PhD, has initiated steps to revise the current plan.

APA staff in partnership with governance groups is initiating measures, some radical, all needed, to respond to shifting pressures. Proposals, arising from discussions by a consortium of governance stakeholders and staff, for an innovative restructuring of APA's sister organizations, the APA 501 c (3) and APAPO 501 c (6), are expected to reach the floor of the CoR in 2018. The Policy and Planning Board, which has responsibility to maintain APA's Bylaws, has begun the first revision of the Bylaws in more than two decades. As a first step, the General Counsel, Deanne Ottaviano, is examining the Bylaws for consistency with current corporate law.

In addition, APA is making concerted efforts to increase efficiency and reduce administrative costs by shifting from expensive in person meetings to virtual meetings. The shift has already

helped mitigate a multi-million-dollar deficit in the operating budget. How effective and efficient the shift has been requiring a true evaluation of its impact on both the productivity of governance groups and its impact on APA staff meeting their responsibilities. An initial poll of affected groups has been conducted and is being reviewed by the BoD at this writing.

Externally, APA is responding to major shifts in healthcare policy. Most significant among them are governmental changes to the Affordable Care Act affecting access to care. The proliferation of master's level professionals continues to generate questions in the healthcare community about accreditation, competencies, and scope of practice concerns that affect training and practice. Among those are Council for Accreditation for Counseling and Related Education Programs (CACREP) actions to limit the training and supervision in master's level counseling to CACREP-approved programs, effectively excluding all doctoral level psychologists who are not from a CACREP-approved program. The implications for APA-approved clinical education programs and entry level requirements for practice are clear and consequential. While others welcome the increasing numbers of master's level prepared individuals in the research and practice of psychology outside healthcare settings as a positive direction for psychology, there is concern for others about the scope of practice for master's level clinicians and how it will impact doctoral level psychologist in private practice settings. This is an area in which APA must identify and carefully evaluate how potential actions that might be taken to address concerns in one area would affect the entirety of our discipline. Indeed, as both research and practice in psychology becomes more specialized, APA will be increasingly challenged to meet the sometimes conflicting needs and interests among its members and the public that it is the mission of the APA to protect and improve.

Beyond challenges within the profession and the science of psychology, APA has to monitor and inform public discourse on a multitude of issues affecting the welfare of the Nation, such as its annual report on stress in America and its Healthy Workplace Awards. P&P's 2016 annual report addressed the interplay between the APA's mission focused on science, education, access to quality healthcare, and social justice with the APAPO's focus on psychologists' parity with other healthcare professions – our organization must be sensitive to represent not only the guild interests of psychologists, through our c(6), but to advance the role of the profession in furthering the public good through our c(3). This includes public health issues like obesity and opioid crises. Outside the healthcare arena, psychology contributes to advancements in public safety, performance and well-being in the workplace, and scientific methods. The list goes on. Wherever human behavior is of import, APA in the name of psychology can and should provide leadership.

APA is also the world's largest organization of psychologists and as such must function as a global citizen in a world that is changing rapidly. APA has signed memoranda of understanding

with sister psychological associations around the globe, fosters productive relationships with international organizations like IUPSYs that promote science and research, and collaborates with other national groups.

Collectively, these landmark changes on the functioning of APA as an organization will ultimately be transformative. In an environment that includes both internal and external pressures thoughtful and extensive deliberations are mandatory. In such an environment the mission of P&P to advise APA and its members becomes more critical.

## A BRIEF HISTORY OF P&P: ITS GENESIS AND LONGEVITY

### P&P's mission

The P&P we know today is the product of a very long evolution (Appendix A *Reunion Breakfast*, 1992). It grew from the Survey and Planning Committee (SPC), sometimes called the Yerkes Committee after its chair, which planned a reorganization of the APA during WWII. The SPC itself was a subcommittee of the Emergency Committee of the National Research Council. It was this committee that recommended the formation of a Policy and Planning Board as its successor, "carrying on its function in the reorganized Association" (Boring et al., 1945). Boring (1945), P&P's first chair, introduced in the board's first report to the APA and the general membership the nature, purpose, and role of P&P as follows:

*The Policy and Planning Board of the American Psychological Association is a deliberative body, concerned with consideration of the long-term policies of the Association and with planning for the advancement of psychology or for its contribution to human welfare in any way in which it is conceived that the Association might take part. The Policy and Planning Board has no executive powers except the power of recommendation to the Council of Representatives and the Directors (Appendix B American Psychologist p, 162).*

Boring further explained that P&P "does not usurp or interfere with the powers of the Council of Representatives or of the Directors... (but anticipates) both bodies will almost certainly welcome carefully formulated recommendations from the Policy and Planning Board, even though they may not always accept them (p. 162).

This cursory review of P&P's history from its first conception during WWII to its present iteration reveals the importance and value that a body that views APA from a distance can provide. As such, P&P must foster its capacity to assist APA in meeting the ever-changing psychological demands of the nation and its people. Understanding P&P's history in this way explicates its unique position in the organizational chart, reporting to the BOD, the COR, and directly to the general membership.

In addition to its functions to monitor, advise, and recommend, P&P has historical responsibility for the following:

- *Drafting a Five-year comprehensive report on the Association's health and activities with four annual intervening reports.*
- *Conducting periodic revision of the APA Bylaws.*
- *Maintaining the Council Policy Manual and managing its 5-year review.*
- *Maintaining APA policies, and tracking standards and guidelines.*
- *Conducting a five-year evaluation of all governance groups.*

### Managing transformation

At times of far-reaching change such as APA is undertaking, it takes the partnership of member, governance, and staff to effect the transformations we desire and need. Compromising that partnership will jeopardize the worth of what emerges. While we lurch and rock over waves at times wild, it is as wise as it is necessary to anchor ourselves in the ideals and traditions that do not change. They are embedded and embodied in the APA's Principles of our Code of Ethics, in our mission statements, and in our Core Values. Justice, Respect, Beneficence. These are our touchstones. They can, do, and should rule every one of us toward every other of us.

### The 2018 Report: A Preview

Based on its mission as described in the APA Bylaws, its history, and what it can and should be able to accomplish, P&P will embark on a self-study during 2018. That self-study will form the core of P&P's 2018 annual report. The P&P Board's intent is to survey the literature and formulate a structure for the self-study based on best practices, forms and formats, for reviewing the successes and opportunities for improvement of a not for profit board. The goal is to make certain that P&P is contributing to the strategic mission of the APA as was intended when P&P was established. P&P will ask whether it serves a useful function in the organization, has it maximized its contributions to APA and the field psychology, and if it should continue in its current form and function. If it should continue as a standing board within the APA governance structure, then, the self-study will address what P&P can do to further maximize its contributions to the future of our Association.

AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

-----  
CENTENNIAL CONVENTION

-----  
AUGUST 14-18, 1992

-----  
REUNION BREAKFAST

-----  
WASHINGTON, D.C.

-----  
APA 1992

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

DR. JACKSON: Good morning.

(Audience responds "good morning.")

DR. JACKSON: I'm sure that -- oh, that's right. The woman from Washington yesterday insisted on a response. Thank you. Unlike Gerald Ford, I'm sure you can do two things at once, both to listen and eat, so we can begin so that we won't have to rush.

For those of you who don't know me, I'm John Jackson. I'm a member of the P and P Board -- current member -- and I am serving as the chairperson of this P&P Reunion Breakfast, the theme of which is reflections across the years.

Having introduced myself as a member of the current P&P board, I'd like to introduce other members who are on the current P&P Board to our audience to our past chairs, whom we are pleased to welcome, and we will say more about that in just a few moments.

The current members of the present P&P Board are Florence L. Denmark. Florence, would you raise your hand. I don't think there's anybody here who doesn't know you. I don't think Stewart Hulse is here, is he, yet? Okay. Greg Kimble. I think Greg is also well known. Steven Morin. All of the board members are well known. Tom D. Oakland. Tom is our current chair, chair of the current board. Norma P. Simon. Diane J. Willis and May Lee Billet-Ziskin.

There's another group of very wonderful people with us this morning. I'd like to introduce them next. We couldn't function without them. They have served the boards well since 1977 and, as I introduce each, perhaps each would like to say just a few words to the past chairs. From --

MAN: Kind words.

(Laughter)

DR. JACKSON: From 1977 to June of 1988 for a 10 year span of time, Jo Ann Horai was the primary staff liaison to P&P. She is back with us this morning and we welcome you, Jo Ann. It's good to have you with us. Perhaps you'd like to say a word or two.

DR. HORAI: Yes. Thank you. It's a surprise being asked to say a word but --

(Laughter)

DR. HORAI: It's always easier to say more words than a few words. So this may come out longer than I wanted.

But when I was thinking about this group, it occurred to me that the rage today in management is TQM, total quality management, and really, although dressed up in new language, that really means efficient operations and getting all the pieces to put together effectively. And that really what the P&P Board does. So, you know, it's been there way before the movement ever came and I was glad to have spent some time with it. Thank you.

DR. JACKSON: Thank you very much.

(Applause)

DR. JACKSON: When Jo Ann left in '87, Nancy Forest picked up the duties in November of that year and remained with the board until June of 1990. Nancy, where are you? Oh, there she is.

MS. FOREST: -- opportunity when you said it had to be kind words.

(Laughter)

MS. FOREST: Actually, this is -- I just want to thank the Policy and Planning Board for some of the happiest memories that I have as being a staff person at APA. It was truly a pleasure to work with you

(Applause)

DR. JACKSON: And when Nancy left in 1990, Sarah Jordan came aboard and has been with us since, and Sarah is carrying on the tremendous work, the high quality set by Jo Ann -- Sarah. Sorry. I'm confused. Sarah Jordan came aboard and is carrying on the high level of work that was started by or from the days of Jo Ann and Nancy. Sarah.

MS. JORDAN: I just have to echo Nancy's words. This is the most wonderful group of people that I've been able to work with, I think, in APA, an outstanding board, a wonderful mixture of all the interests of the Association in one room and you can't beat that. Thank you.

(Applause)

DR. JACKSON: Let me warn the past chairs now that they will not have the luxury of the three ladies who just spoke to us. When it comes time for them to chat with us, I would like for them to come to the podium and speak from this spot where I am standing. There's a reason for that.

On behalf of the staff you've just been reintroduced to and the current P&P Board, I am pleased to welcome you back to this P&P reunion of past chairs. It's wonderful to have you with us. We have anticipated this reunion with some excitement, I must admit, since we came up with the idea and decided that this was really the thing that we wanted to do. We see this as a very important meeting but we don't want it to be stuffy. We want it to be informal and hopefully, that's the way it will be.

When I looked back at the minutes of the first meeting of that first board, the first meeting of the first board, it said Introductorily, "The Policy and Planning Board of the American Psychological Association is a deliberative body concerned with consideration of the long term policies of the Association and with planning for the advancement of psychology or for the contribution to human welfare in any way in which it is conceived that the Association might take part.

The Policy and Planning Board has no executive power except the power of recommendation to the Council of Representatives or to the Directors, but this power is likely to prove to be considerable since the board, after due deliberation, takes the initiative and such recommendations carry great weight."

You in your capacity as chairs of past boards have seen to it that those boards have been faithful to this original declaration. For that, we honor you for your dedication and your achievement. Thank you very much for carrying on until this day.

If you will look at your place, you will find there a token of our appreciation. It's a small weight, paper weight. But you know, you give weighty things to weighty people and we hope that you will  
-- we know you will use this well.

Our gathering this morning is going to serve two purposes. 1) It will give us the opportunity, as we are now hopefully, honoring you as past chairs for your active leadership that has provided the support for APA's development to the high level it has evolved today. And 2) it will give us the opportunity to communicate, as I've said earlier, back across the years so that we have some idea, we remind ourselves perhaps once again where P&P has been and where we are today and hopefully where we will -- we anticipate going the first year of the next 100 years.

The first P&P Board was appointed by the Board of Directors at the 53rd annual meeting of P&P meeting in Evanston, Illinois on September 6, 7 and 8 of 1945. Today, the board has had 39 chairs over 47 years. Most -- that's 32 -- served one year each. Six served two years each and one was so dedicated that he served three consecutive years as chairperson of P&P.

We are pleased to have with us and to hear from 15 -- if they're all here -- 15 of the chairs today plus the chair of the upcoming board next year. So when I ask you to come forward, would you please come to the podium and talk with us.

Dr. Ernest Hilgard was there at the beginning of P&P. Dr. Hilgard.

(Applause)

MR. JACKSON: We want you to be sure to speak into the mic so they can record it.

DR. HILGARD: The year 1946 when things were getting started was a year of great excitement. It was the first time that we had a central office and Dale Wolfle had almost miraculously got out the first issue of the *American Psychologist* to appear in January of that year though the organization had scarcely been confirmed by the affiliated people who had to vote in favor of the new constitution and bylaws. But anyhow, he was very helpful in the first meeting which was presided over  
-- the board met without having a chairman but itself elected Boring as chair of that first meeting. He was on a one year appointment so that that set the original policy of having a chair for only one year.

But anyhow, the precedents for the P&P Board had been set more or less by a board that's commonly called that in the Social Science Research Council and many of us had found that an effective organization and that was one reason it got incorporated into the revised Bylaws of the APA. Several of us had worked in the so-called "Yerkes Committee" during the war. That was a committee on Policy and Planning also that was sort of behind the constitutional convention and three of its members, Boring, Marquis and I, were on this original board so that we were pretty well oriented to the kinds of things that we hoped the board would do.

However, I'm to report really on the following year when I was chosen as chair and Dale Wolfley met with us again and proved very

helpful. To replace three of the earlier members, Boring, Carlyle Jacobsen and Rensis Likert who had served one year terms, the new members were Clarence Grimm of Columbia, Robert Sears then at Iowa, and David Shakow who was poking somewhere around New York. Sears was elected chair the following year. Hardly any of these people are still around. I have the good fortune of good health at 88 so in some sense I'm speaking for them.

Well, in our particular meeting which, as I say, was the second meeting, we first of all discussed some problems of defining who is a qualified psychologist. The issue, while a perennial one, had come up particularly regarding officers in the military who had psychological responsibilities and how much training and background should they have before we recognized them as psychologists. But anyhow, the post-war period, it took quite a while to get it all unraveled and to become fully civilians again.

This led into a discussion of certification versus licensing. I think we all understand that difference. To be called a certified psychologist or some similar name simply means we're recognized for qualifications. It does not say anything about the nature of the practice that would be allowed. Whereas licensing means the right to perform special services for a fee. And so there were issues as between favoring certification versus licensing.

The American Board of Professional Psychology, ABPP, as we called it in those days, had already been established to certify those at the Ph.D. level who became Diplomates. So we started with that as a background to talk about accreditation of the universities qualified to train the specialists who themselves would be on the way to becoming Diplomates. Actually, 29 departments, Ph.D. granting departments, had already become fully accredited and 11 were partially accredited because they were limited to training in special sub-fields rather than across the board. A report by Robert Sears on certification appeared in the 1947 *American Psychologist* along with report of this Policy and Planning Committee.

We discussed the problems of non-doctoral training at both undergraduate and graduate level. There was consensus the significance of applied psychology should be recognized and should be taught at all levels with some hands on experiences of interviewing and what not but not conceived as professional training. The MA should not be conceived as a professional degree. This has been a source of some controversy right along.

We noted that we favored seeking public policy implications in such areas as social psychology and educational psychology which is obviously relevant to the culture.

The central office and the divisional structure was reviewed since it was just getting underway and it was recommended that a manual should be prepared to guide division officers in carrying out their duties. These are the kinds of recommendations that were carried out then by the Board of Directors. The general spirit was that the prolonged discussions of policy issues without the pressure for decisions on details made the P&P Board a valuable supplement to the Board of Directors without impinging on the board's responsibility, and I think that pattern has been followed since.

Thank you.

(Applause)

DR. JACKSON: Doctor Hilgard acquaints us with some of the heavy weight issues that they dealt with, but he didn't touch upon another rather interesting aspect of that meeting I had hoped he would when they went out to play on the seesaw. Maybe that can be touched on another time.

Dr. John Gray Peatman chaired the board in 1950. Dr. Peatman is unable to be with us but he has sent a statement and let me read it to you.

\*May 24, '92. Dear Dr. Jackson, thank you for your invitation as reunion chair to participate in the commemoration of APA's centennial anniversary. I regret I can not be present. In my 89th year, I am not up to the trip to Washington.

As chairman of the first quinquennial review -- means every five years -- of APA bylaws, I had substantial and unfailing aid of A.G. Boring. We members of the board wanted Gary to be chairman in 49-50 but he agreed to be on the subcommittee of four only if someone else among our nine members would serve as chair, so I was duly elected.

Our main concerns were APA's divisional structure and the relation and role of state organizations in APA activities. Some members thought 17 divisions -- yes, 17 -- were too many. As a result, we sent a questionnaire to the nearly 7,000 APA members and received more than 3,500 replies. Most of our recommendations were based on the results of this membership poll and were approved in 1950. In the mean

time, the results were published in a series of five articles appearing in the *American Psychologist* in the fall of 1949. The board made no recommendation on the relation of state organizations to APA. It did not recommend the Ph.D. for associate membership but did recommend an additional year of graduate study as a compromise for only the next five years.

We also recommended a student affiliate class of membership. We did recommend the following: that divisions continue having a minimum of two Council representatives but that the ceiling of six be eliminated and a graduate formula be used for additional representatives, that regional representatives be abolished, that the minimum number of APA members for the establishment of a division be increased from 50 to 100, that the retiring president of APA continue as a member of the Board of Directors for another year as past president, and that members of APA for 25 years do not have to pay APA dues after attaining the age of 65.

The members of the Policy and Planning Board of 49-50 were Gary Boring, Stu Cook, Wayne Dennis, Ren Likert, Gene MacFarland, Don Marquis, Helen Peak and John Peatman.

I salute the memory of my friend associates this Memorial Day of 1992. Sincerely, John Peatman."

He encloses a letter, part of which I will share with you. It is written on Harvard University stationary, Psychological Laboratory, dated 11 March, 1950 and Doctor Peatman writes in the upper left corner, "This is a copy of my greatest treasure from APA activities."

The letter is from Edward G. Boring and begins, "Dear Wonderful, I do not know how you do it but you have accomplished everything needful. If you need to do a month's work in a week with all your secretaries sick, you do it. You must be electronic." And just incidentally, he had to type this letter himself that he sent because all of his secretaries were on vacation, so he's still at it.

And it ends, which is an interesting recommendation, "I enclose another letter to you which I dictated after I read the supplementary minutes. It is about the projects for next year. "I do not see why letters of this type should not be turned over now to Lyle, assuming he is elected, and why he should not overlap you in anticipation of next year just as you overlapped Ren. You might actually get more continuity by letting the chairman-elect operate anticipatorily on next year's job. It has really been wonderful having you as chair and having the advantage of your skill and efficiency. Signed Garry."

In 1960, a gentleman came to the chairmanship of P&P by the name of Kenneth B. Clark. He was the first chair during the middle decade of the '60s and '70s. Others who followed Doctor Clark in 1963 were Dr. Neil Bartlett, 1964 Dr. Gregory A. Kimble, 1971 and '72 Dr. Stanley E. Seashore, 1973 and '74 Dr. John A. Stern, and 1976, 1977 and 1978 Dr. Norman Abeles.

Dr. Clark, and will the others follow Dr. Clark in the order mentioned. Dr. Clark, would you come to the podium at this time.  
(Applause)

DR. CLARK: I don't have very much to say except to tell you I don't remember all of this history and I used to ask my colleagues such as George Albee, do I have to be serious about these things. And I remember George Albee's response. "Pretend." Well, I won't pretend. I'll just tell you that I enjoyed the breakfast and I'm looking forward -- I was fascinated by Ernest's history and looking forward to what others who have much better memories than I will be saying. Thank you.

(Applause)

DR. JACKSON: 1963, Dr. Neil R. Bartlett.

(Applause)

DR. BARTLETT: When I was chair, we had to conduct a review of the old business of APA and we didn't know how to do it, so Jack Darley was the executive secretary at the APA and he got on the phone and he called Chuck Bray and that phone call took a long time, if you know those two gentleman. And after they got off, if you know the people around the Policy and Planning Board -- one of them is right there, Greg Kimble -- there was an awful lot of gabbing, and I was chair so I knew that my role was simply to push and push and push and to try to get that meeting over with somehow.

Now, we had to review the whole structure of APA. Well, I don't know what the mandate is for that review. That's why we were calling Jack Darley. But let me tell you what was in the air at that time. We've already had something of the story here from Jack and from what you were just reading. At that particular time, there really was a battle raging in the states over the issues of applied psychology versus academia because something had happened the year before and this made it imperative that we look to the structure of APA and what was going to happen in the divisions.

What had happened the year before is that the Commissioner of Education of the state of New York had sent to all of the colleges



and universities a letter -- well, not requesting -- essentially ordering us to submit our curriculum, our library holdings and all the other kinds of things that we had to the Commissioner of Education in the state of New York with the view that if your program is approved by the Commissioner of Education in the state of New York, your students when they win their degree may be able to practice in the state of New York. It was essentially that. And that put the fear of God in many of us because we suddenly saw this means chaos with regard to anything that the APA could do.

So I think our meeting was taken up in large measure by that particular issue, and so we spent a lot of time arguing about what the divisional structure would be.

I am proud to tell you that the year before the graduate chairman had pretty well taken care of the issue.

(END TAPE 1, SIDE 1; BEGIN TAPE 1, SIDE 2.)

DR. BARTLETT: -- virtually all of them, telling the Commissioner of Education in the state of New York that we felt we could not file our programs with any agency other than the professional and scientific societies with which departments were associated or our board of trustees or the state in which we were located.

Well, I think that background of what was going on at that time will help you understand what a lot of the conversation was when we were considering the divisional structure of APA.

I'll stop there.

(Applause)

DR. JACKSON: Dr. Gregory A. Kimble became chairperson of the P&P in 1964. Greg.

DR. KIMBLE: I might begin by mentioning that the members of P&P when I was chair were Ann Anastasi, Harold Kelley, Charlie Cofer who succeeded me as chair, Arthur Melton, Carroll Sharf, F. Nowell Jones, Gardner Lindzey and Rains Wallace and Rains became chair. I think, after Charlie perhaps it was.

At that time, *American Psychologist* didn't publish anything about what P&P did so when I went to do my research about what our activities had been, I couldn't find much of anything and what I could find didn't match what my recollection was of things that we were concerned with.

The main things that came to mind were first, that we were concerned with the size and composition of Council. Don't know whether it was when I was chair or maybe when Neil was or even earlier, but we forwarded a recommendation of some kind of proposal -- I don't know what it was any more -- that would have limited Council to about 85 members. Predictably, Council shot that down.

What they did accept was something that apparently had been in the works for longer than I realized which was the percentage arrangements that still survive about membership that a division has to have to be represented by how many people on Council.

The other thing that we spent a lot of time on -- I don't know whether other boards have done it or not -- was the status of fellow in APA. Several of us had gotten letters from friends of ours with, at best, marginal credentials asking to be put up for fellowship in the organization because, as they always put it, it was time for them to become fellows. And we took offense at that and decided that survival wasn't sufficient credential for that kind of an honor and that, besides that, applying for an honor is not very tasteful.

So we put in our report, wherever it went, some kind of mechanism that would have made fellowship in APA, at least as I put it in my own words, comparable to fellowship of the Royal Society. It would be a great mark of distinction that would come to a relatively small number of people.

As I say, there weren't any published reports. I suppose what happened was that our report went to the Board of Directors and found its way to Council. In any event, there were reactions to that proposal and we got accused of being the old boys exercising our network and perpetuating everything that was wrong with APA. And there was a letter in the New York newsletter or whatever they had of the New York Psychological Association in which the editor took great offense at that proposal and ended up saying that it reminded him of *Candy*. Remember the dirty book that was very popular in those days and what *Candy* had said in her final dying moment, according to the editor, was "Good grief."

And so I did a thing that I frequently find therapeutic, Herb. I wrote a letter that I didn't send in which I called attention to the conspicuous lack of scholarly credentials that kept some people from ever achieving fellowship in APA because what *Candy* really had said in her final moments would have made the case better. What she really said was, "Good grief, it's daddy."

Thank you.

(Laughter and applause)

DR. JACKSON: Greg has been a troublemaker from way back.

The next chair who responded to our invitation was Stanley E. Seashore. Dr. Seashore was chair of P&P in 1971. Dr. Seashore is unable to be with us but he did send me a statement to be read to you, and let me read what Dr. Seashore says. I've read all of your statements and my wife thought I was going crazy at several times. I was howling so, laughing. You got so much humor into it. Some of this, I think, will come through as we proceed.

"Statement submitted by Stanley E. Seashore for the Policy and Planning Board August 15, '92." He says, "I regret my absence from this reunion meeting of past chairs of the P&P Board. My absence arises not from lack of interest but from lack of easy mobility. Travel is onerous.

My recollections of membership and a year of chairmanship are entirely pleasant ones. The meetings with diverse colleagues were always enjoyable with a good mix of debate, discussion and hilarity. Occasionally, we did some useful things.

Fortunately, enough time has passed to allow me some candor along with the following firmly held but possibly unreliable remarks.

My year of chairmanship -- that term reveals just how long ago the event occurred -- was one of those periodic years that required a state of the Association report to the Board of Directors along with the recommendations for the future. The group opted to focus on the emerging tribal discontents with the Association. The academic, professional, scientific, social activists and other ethnic subgroups all felt somewhat disadvantaged with APA not quite attuned to their several and somewhat incompatible needs. This dissension, I must say, was more moderate than in present day Yugoslavia and Azerbaidzhan but of similar origin: psychological.

Our report proposed several policy and program changes that would acknowledge the differences and provide a degree of protected autonomy and program specificity for each of the contentious factions. This was not an original idea. Similar tolling of the toxin had occurred earlier and, as you know, erupted with loud noise in the late 1980s.

Well, the Board of Directors did not acknowledge receipt of the report. They did not, as the Bylaws suggest, refer the report to the Council for debate. The report was not published in the *American Psychologist*, as was the custom. One might think that the report was untimely, politically inept, ill phrased, ill conceived or, one of these.

In any case, the report went into the dead files and is interesting only as a curious event in the historical annals of APA.

It would be a mistake to consider the report entirely fruitless. The situation provided an excellent case for review by my students in their seminars on the diagnosis, planning and execution of organizational adaptation to environmental change. Also, we do learn from our failures. History does occasionally confirm the merit of previously discarded ideas.

May APA continue to change, to adapt, and to prosper."

(Applause)

DR. JACKSON: They're just really delightful. I've enjoyed reading them.

Dr. Seashore, as I said, I think I mentioned he was chair in 1971. He was chair 1971 and 1972.

Dr. John A. Stern was chair in 1973 and 1974. Dr. Stern, I thought he was here. I thought he had come in. I have his statement and I haven't read it too carefully. Let me read it for him then.

He says "Some reminiscences and ruminations of my time on P&P.

My first workshop meeting with the board followed the Vail Conference on clinical psychological training. The focus of our 'retreat' was to look into the future of psychology with guidance by 'real experts' in the field. I had voiced some skepticism about such a meeting since my ability to predict the future up to that point had been dismal.

As a junior member of the board, I was hesitant about voicing any concerns and went along with the 'wise old men.' In any case, I thought I might profit both personally and professionally from this conference, not to mention how it might help with the deliberations of the P&P Board.

A position paper in which we would spell out more clearly than previous boards had done what the next five years or perhaps 10 years might bring to the field of psychology was to be the end product.

After attending the meeting in Vail -- a place where at that time the air was clean, the sky clear and the discussions interminable

but with little substance other than to reaffirm good and decry evil

- I took off for Santa Cruz.

Brewster Smith was a delightful host. We met for five days in a lovely setting at the university. My family came along to experience life in California and I spent most of my evenings with them.

My recollections of the conference was that we politely listened to each other, to wise men from other disciplines including architecture, as well as to one or two people who were supposed to be bonafide futurists - or were they futurologists? Most of my companions on the board were enthusiastic about the discussions, believed that great ideas were being discussed, and were generally pleased with what transpired.

I, on the other hand, felt increasingly uncomfortable. I could not generate the same contagious enthusiasm expressed by the others, experienced some doubt and wondered whether:

1) I had made a mistake by bringing my family along and not partaking of the intellectually stimulating discussions that I must have missed during the informal evening talks (privately I wondered about what the group was smoking, popping or drinking to generate their feelings of accomplishment.)

2) I wondered whether I really belonged to this group of intellectual giants with avant garde ideas I could not understand dealing with abstract concepts beyond my feeble intellect.

I expressed my dismay to the others of the board and to Allen Boneau, who represented central office, and said that I would not be able to participate in the writing of the position paper since I frankly did not know what the hell was going on."

Sounds like a delightful man. I would love to have known him.

"I was absolved from the writing task. On the last day of the conference, the majority present, still buoyed by the feelings of accomplishment, divided the task of writing the report with drafts to Boneau by a given date with drafts of the position paper to all of us shortly thereafter.

To the best of my knowledge, no final report was ever produced. I am still unable to see very far into the future, either in my personal or professional life, but my self doubts are considerably abated.

On the positive side, my period on the board was a good experience. In general, when someone accepted responsibility for getting something done, it was done and on time. I also learned that a one person subcommittee when it comes to writing is a lot more successful than having two or more persons attend to attempt to draft a position paper.

I have left substance out of my comments but I'm sure that others will emphasize the contributions of P&P during their tenure."

In his final paragraph Dr. Stern says, "This commentary is a little longer than you asked for, but as I have gotten older have gotten a little more long-winded. Besides, whoever listens to admonitions from chair members of committees?"

(Applause)

DR. JACKSON: Really delightful.

The next chairperson of P&P is Dr. Norman Abeles. As I said earlier, Dr. Abeles was chairperson of P&P for 1976, 1977 and 1978. Norm.

(Applause)

DR. ABELES: First of all, I want you to know that we did publish a report. I've got it right here.

The reason I was chair for three years, I believe, is that Jack Darley, Jr. and I were supposed to share the chairpersonship for one year because he was going off on sabbatical and I was going off some place also and we sort of split it for a year and then somehow I got to be chairperson and I got re-elected again and again, so that's how it happened as I recall.

But we had a distinguished group of psychologists who served on the board during my tenure. John Lacy was the Board of Directors liaison and he and I argued constantly because he tried to control the committee and so on and we debated that. And then Jackie Gibson was there. Izzy Chein, Angus Campbell, as I said John Darley, Lina Asti, Dick Thompson, Ray Fowler, Frank Finger, Ed Bordin, Jane Kessler. All those people at one time or another were members of the P&P Board.

We had an unusual subtitle to the five year report of the P&P Board because we wanted to get people's attention. It was titled "Do Not Let Them Immanentize the Eschaton: Diversity, Strength and Strains." The title had been popularized by Bill Buckley, Jr. and seemed particularly appropriate at the time since in the vernacular of the times it translated very roughly as "keep the faith, baby." On the other hand,

It underscored that Utopia was not for this world. You remember the old ads about you've come a long way, baby and so on. It would be probably sexist now but at that time it seemed the appropriate thing to say.

We noted, however, that there was decreased federal funding. We decried the politicization within our own Association. We noted the disenchantment of the many individuals with national political processes and so on. It was close to Watergate, by the way.

Does any of that seem familiar to you now?

Additionally, we addressed such topics as whether the Association should take official stands on the public policy matters and made certain recommendations. We pointed out that many members did support the airings of specific social actions but wanted such airings to be limited to those cases where these actions are based on methodologically adequate data.

Another issue addressed in that report had to do with the operation of Council. With regard to social policy and Council, we raised the question as to whether or not Council was devoting sufficient time to public policy issues bearing on psychology as a science.

We also posed questions concerning the dues structure, the annual convention and APA and support for science. Also, we predicted a total membership of well over 60,000 by 1985 and commented that the boundaries between narrow scientific fields of scientific psychology and applied psychology would become more permeable. We pointed out the increasing interest in the diagnosis and treatment of medical problems by psychophysicists and we quoted the work of Lacy and Lacy.

We also said that Reitan and the others who were doing a lot of good work between brain and behavior kind of relationships and we suggested that experts in social psychology and experts in human memory have become increasingly involved in research in aspects of law and legal processes. We noted significant research in combined studies by developmental, social and physiological psychologists on the effect of early nutrition on human growth and development.

We observed that a psychological knowledge is put on the practice by psychological scientists. Practitioners in psychology will return to the scientific base.

We hope that in the future psychology will achieve an integration between science and application so the psychology could then play a more effective role in serving society.

Thank you.

(Applause)

DR. JACKSON: Dr. Herbert J. Freudenberger, P&P chair for 1980 and 1981.

MAN: Herb has just stepped out.

DR. JACKSON: All right. We will skip over Herb and go directly to 1982. The chair that year was Dr. Paul W. Thayer.

(Applause)

DR. THAYER: Thank you. I had the pleasure of serving with Jack Bardon, Jules Barron, Jeanne Gullahorn, James Jackson, Burt Raven, Dave Rodgers and Jerry Singer with John Conger as the Board liaison and all were most ably supported by that former and most organized staff member Joan Horai.

The major issues addressed that year, as they are every year as you've heard today, were organization of APA, division growth, involvement of members in the governing structure, membership requirements and convention time allocation.

And, having solved all those problems, we also took on the monumental task of training the *Monitor* staff to be consistent in using doctoral suffixes such as M.D., Ph.D., and Psy.D. and I can say with considerable pride -- and I challenge the rest of you -- to be able to say something comparable. I noted in the current *Monitor* that the staff is still following the recommendations that we made at that time, and I think that's a major achievement of our board.

(Laughter)

DR. THAYER: As to the APA organization, we continued the forms trial which had started the previous year under Herb. Our first evaluation yielded cautious optimism on the part of the Council of Representatives and members but the second meeting's evaluation showed that the hope for division of labor by Forum A and Forum 1 -- remember -- did not occur and that the issues debated in the forums were debated all over again. And, as the structural changes we recommended did not get through the Board of Directors -- that must sound familiar to all of you -- our successor P&P Board saw the demise of the forums

trial.

As I suspect Herb will indicate, we had recommended a moratorium on new divisions to the Council of Representatives, and it had complied. And during the moratorium, we studied other organizations and recommended the mechanisms used by AERA, substantive interest groups, SIGS, as non-governance alternatives to divisions for those with common scientific or professional interests.

Apparently, psychologists are more power hungry than AERA members as this proposal never got to the membership for a vote.

We also recommended against a seat for each state on Council as it would double its size and increase expenses, and we also recommended against the creation of a divisional liaison in central office, something that many divisions did not want.

We also recommended a Bylaw change to require state associations to adopt APA membership standards.

We made a number of recommendations to Council with regard to old versus new blood in the governing structure. Council was unwilling to adopt any such rules, but they did permit us to contact boards and committees recommending that new blood should be injected when other things were equal, clearly less than we had hoped for. And the game of musical chairs continues to this day as we all move from chair to chair to chair.

As to convention hours, we discovered that scheduling in our allocation was still done by hand and recommended that appropriate hard and software be acquired.

As an active member of the afore-mentioned musical chair group, I was later appointed to BCA where we took P&P's recommendation to restructure the hours in a more equitable fashion and ended up devising the infamous Thayer Formula for allocation of hours to divisions. I frankly think they put that label on it because they were unhappy with me and my reputation as a trouble maker.

In 1990, I was a member of a special task force to restructure the convention and, for the third consecutive time -- my record is unbroken -- we failed to get anything accomplished vis à vis this intractable problem.

And I guess my feelings of powerlessness may be shared by some of you, but I can say that working with that particular report was a really exciting and stimulating time.

Thank you.

(Applause)

DR. JACKSON: I think Dr. Stern has returned now. Is that right? I'm sorry. Dr. Freudenberger has returned. Dr. Herbert J. Freudenberger was chairman of P&P for 1980 and 1981. Dr. Freudenberger.

(Applause)

DR. FREUDENBERGER: Good morning. First I'll speak of a few anecdotes, but one person I do want to acknowledge without whom the two years of chair would have been impossible. That's Jo Ann Horai. I thank you for all your valued contributions and magnificent help.

The funny part of my appointment is that once I was appointed, Max Siegle came over to me and put his hand around my shoulder. He said, "You know, this is going to be terrible for you." I said, "What do you mean?" He said, "Well, you're going to be dealing with John Lacey." He said, "You're going to be dealing with Carolyn Sherif." And he said, "Last but not least, you know this guy, Paul Thayer." I said, "Well, luckily, Max, Paul Thayer and I have had a kind of peripheral relationship in the insurance industry so I have some knowledge of him and hopefully he won't be too bad." He said, "But Herb, you're the only clinician on that Policy and Planning Board. You're not going to get anything done. They're going to destroy you." So he said, "So have a good time, boychick."

Well, it didn't work out that way. First of all, the hostility was demonstrated by nominating and electing me as chair of the board twice but, more importantly, I extracted from John Lacy the truth that John had been in therapy for a few months somewhere during his career. Of course, he constantly proclaimed to me that it was a didactic therapeutic experience, had nothing to do with anything personal. But subsequent to that, I know we always sought out a couch somewhere during our retreat meetings so he could lie down and I could sit in back of me and he could talk to me about his problems.

But it was really a delightful group. We spent a great deal of time laughing. We also accomplished a great deal. I am very grateful to this mini group because when we were writing the five year report, Paul Thayer was extremely helpful but more significantly at that moment, John Lacy and Carolyn Sherif stayed with me until about 2:00 in the morning at the APA building. In fact, Mike Pallak came in and he said, "What are you three crazies doing here?" Well, we're writing the five year report. It was published and I think it made some contribution and I'd like to read to you a little bit of some of our thoughts and reflections as to how we saw it and what we felt was going

to take place.

It was during that period of time the Board of Ethnic Minorities came into play for the first time. We, as a P&P Board, talked about the importance of the emerging groups, that new roles for women needed to be dealt with. The resolution of a problem in terms of handicapped psychologists needed to be addressed and we strongly made a point that gay male and lesbian psychologist issues as an emerging group needed to be addressed within APA. And, subsequent to that, these emerging groups really became into fruition.

We talked about what we perceived was the importance of the state psychological Associations and I think that's an issue that's become certainly profound over the years. We addressed the doctoral versus masters degree --

(END TAPE 1, SIDE 2; BEGIN TAPE 2, SIDE 1.)

DR. FREUDENBERGER: -- should be looked at but I think it's still sort of hanging out in the back woods. It's now coming through as a certificate in alcoholism counseling which is below the master's degree so that that issue is more or less around.

We did say that we felt that the beginnings of the professional school in the Psy.D. degree and that trend would have a profound impact on the years ahead on the organization of APA, on both its image as well as application of psychology. And that has been, you know, shown to be quite correct.

Sadly enough, we talked about polarization which I think also previous boards addressed, and we said that we felt that polarization in terms of applied research, basic science and a professional practitioner would lead to fields, unless these differing views of these groups concerning their specific issues would be addressed. Subsequent to that, as you know, the commission was established, etcetera, etcetera, but sadly enough, I think the polarization did continue for many years and is probably still not totally resolved.

We talked about major external pressures on psychology including employment, accountability which, of course, has now turned into the issue of peer review and from there, peer review, the HMO, managed care.

We addressed the issues of sunset legislation which was becoming quite important at the time which subsequently culminated in the whole issue of Florida. We talked about legal regulation of psychological testing and changes in the status and funding of basic and applied research.

I think we really addressed issues that were important and I think we addressed issues that became, subsequent to that, issues of serious concern to the psychological profession.

I would like to just read to you briefly the recommendations at the end that we did make. This was, as with Norman and others, it was published. It was addressed in Council. Issues were certainly not dismissed. We talked about the requirement of really needing to establish a commission on the organization of APA which Bonnie Strickland was critically involved in, as I was, but unfortunately didn't really go to a good place.

We paid specific attention to the importance of the interaction of the boards and committees. We felt that there was incredible overlap, there was no clear definition thereof, that the liaison system was outmoded and outdated, was useless and required further exploration and possibly even elimination. Subsequent to that, of course, many, many years later these specialty boards came into existence.

We addressed the issue of the Board of Convention Affairs. I don't think that much has really been done about that. We talked about their needing to address the issue of program time. We talked, of course, of the moratorium that Paul referred to in terms of divisions because five new divisions had come into play during that period of time.

We also addressed the continuation and the need for refinement in terms of cooperative efforts in terms of behavioral, social and biological science as well as the Association's. We addressed the importance of presenting -- developing documents tracing the cumulative contribution of basic scientific psychology to the public welfare. We believed that it was critical that it should be developed. Of course, that didn't take place until many years later and I think it's just starting to get into play now with the science directorate.

We said that we believed -- and this was our last statement -- our differences can and must be resolved for psychology to continue to grow because we believe that if the continuation and the resolving of this issue would not take place there would be the potential for a decisive split within APA which, of course, sadly enough did take place. And this was written in 1980.

I do need to say something anecdotally really at the end. Our board was such a delightful board that Mosifer Sherif, who was Carolyn's husband, who was a rather shy person would come with her to the mid-winter meeting but would not come to any of our dinners or anything else. He would eat alone in the hotel room. And when we found out -- I think Jo Ann will recall -- that this was taking place,

Carolyn prevailed upon Mosfer to come and have dinner with us. Of course, the thing was signed and sealed when he found that I spoke German fluently and he did also. After that, he was my buddy at each dinner meeting and Mosfer, of course, really delightfully enjoyed our company, we his, for the two and a half years that he joined us.

So it was, to me, a very pleasurable, delightful experience. Max Slegle was found to be wrong. John Lacy and I became very, very wonderful colleague friends. Paul Thayer behaved himself, was a nice person, and the whole thing just worked out well and I certainly do miss Carolyn Sherif who was just a sweetheart of helping getting things done. So it's been for me truly, of all the boards I've served, one of the finest, most wonderful and delightful boards where we spent an awful lot of time laughing but also a lot of time contributing and doing.

Thank you.

(Applause)

DR. JACKSON: In 1985 Dr. Bonnie Strickland was chair of P&P.

(Applause)

DR. STRICKLAND: When I came to P&P, I didn't know much about the group or our functions. I noticed quickly that, as Paul mentioned, whatever we recommended didn't seem to have much impact and was generally and routinely disallowed.

My first suggestion to the group was that we disband, and we didn't do that either, and so the hope was that we would become a more active group and really try to use the deliberations of the Policy and Planning Board to affect what we thought were absolutely necessary and needed changes. We saw right away that we were the only group or the only board that had the right to go outside of the Board of Directors and outside of Council to go to a direct vote of the membership. And as we got ourselves sort of roused up, we were prepared to do this if we could come up with plans and programs that we thought were important.

Now, two or three things were -- many, many things were going on but probably the two big events was the emergence of the practice group and differential dues and recall, up until that time, we had very carefully determined that the dues would be similar and yet, it was clear that folks were sharing different values, different interests, and that there were simply different needs. We were a family that was living in one big house and we needed some walls. We needed some opportunity to come together in our different rooms, if you like, and then perhaps come together as a family at dinner and that a lot of this was happening because the demographics were very, very clear. We were increasingly training, educating professionals and they were -- eight or nine out of 10 would join the American Psychological Association and evidently feeling that their needs were being met well within the group whereas less than one out of five of the experimental folks were continuing to join APA.

So the numbers were clearly moving us in certain directions -- the demographics -- no matter what our own plans might be.

As Jim McGaugh said, I thought I had graduated a psychologist but he or she goes to the first neuro-science convention and comes back receptor binder and goes to the first APA convention, if they do, and doesn't go back, not finding a similar specialized sort of group. So we have numerous problems.

The Council did vote a differential dues and certain compromises were being put into place to try to move a reorganization. By this time, we have 44 divisions, as I recall, over 70,000 members, a big change from that 3,000 in 1945. We have 51 state and provincial associations back then -- I think we're now up to about 55 or 56 -- and we had a governing structure in gridlock because the over 100 boards and committees had little input into the Council which was the governance group. So we had the problems of governance, we had the problems of the demographics and we had the problems of the needs for different

-- well, the thoughts about giving people space for their own concerns. We tried it in Forum A and Forum B and everybody came to both and debated both and so it was clear that among these strings was a real need to try to stay together and have an integration these groups. But we're having all these forces one way or the other.

We did two good things. We did appoint the Bardon Committee on Reorganization and that eventually developed into the group on restructuring and by 1988 the Policy and Planning Board did approve the reorganization. Council, in an act of rare courage, voted itself out of existence, 71 to 46, and approved the plan and sent it to the membership. But, as you know, the plan failed with the membership. I think again several things were happening. There were some reorganizations internal. We now have the Practice Directorate, the Science Directorate and the Public Interest Directorate and just lately the Education Directorate. So there were some internal reorganizations and the boards and committees were perhaps becoming a little bit more tied to the functioning directorates and the staff.

But the reorganizations plan failed and probably failed for many different reasons of which perhaps the most was that reorganization was seen as a kind of splitting and the hope was that we would stay together.

The other thing we did of great importance, I think, and we see it come to fruition here -- we appointed the Task Force on the Centennial. That was five - six years ago and that group, I think, has put together an impressive and wonderful birthday celebration for us.

Anyway, P&P were always trouble makers and always rabble rousing and continue to do so and some day some folks are going to listen to us.

Thank you.

(Applause)

DR. JACKSON: 1988 Dr. Robert A. Brown chaired P&P. Bob.

(Applause)

DR. BROWN: When I was coming onto the board, the political tensions in the Association were at full spasm. It may well be that 10 years from now or 15 years from now I can look back at it and put it in a little calmer light, but it seemed very tense at that point. The Policy and Planning Board, at least it seemed in my first year, was operating out of too little information, too little perceived power in the Association and too much responsibility for what was going on in reorganization. I was being crunched between the group on reorganization and the Board of Directors and so the tensions were very high and there was a lot of upset about the Policy and Planning Board.

One of the things that happened after the reorganization failed was to try to see whether we could pull the Policy and Planning Board together and try to bring it back to its roots, and that is to think of it as a long-term deliberative body because, in fact, it had been so tied up in the day-to-day struggle of reorganization that it really didn't have the time and energy to be able to think about what was going to happen 10 or 15 years down the road.

So actually, under the leadership of Bruce Bennett, which was the year before I was chair, we started the process of long-range planning eventuating later in bringing in a consultant and identifying a number of areas that we felt needed to be addressed in terms of the plans. And we picked a couple or three of those actually to begin.

One was the area of membership which we felt -- and I still feel -- is the life blood of the Association. I was also warned about Paul. Paul was the chair of the Membership Committee and we wanted the Membership Committee to take more responsibility for recruitment and retention and the Membership Committee was overwhelmed with the amount of work they had to do and so somebody said, well, Paul Thayer is heading that committee and there's just probably no way that you're going to get him to do anything. So I called Paul and Paul and I had a delightful three or four minute conversation where we agreed in the first 30 seconds what made sense and it was done. I think later, with probably a lot of technical assistance, the Membership Committee has even expanded its charge further.

I really found those kinds of working relationships true in P&P and as we dealt with other boards and committees also, that we were a group that I enjoyed working with and also the inter-relationships with other boards were very important.

There were a couple of things that were interesting. One of the things that probably a number of you were involved in at various times, we formalized it by having at an APA meeting all the board and committee chairs come in in a meeting and so we sat for like two hours with all the APA board and committee chairs and there were wonderful suggestions made. My guess is, of course, that they absolutely disappeared. I don't know. Maybe -- Nancy at that point was the liaison by that year, did just a wonderful job of sort of keeping me and the board and the records together and maybe some things happened with some of those recommendations. They did? That's nice.

Another thing is that in thinking about the increasing diversity of the Association and the interest of the Association we in that year had the first meeting of the APA leadership -- I think Ray was president at that point -- and the presidents of all the associations representing minority psychologists the AB Psy, the Asian, Hispanic, Native American. It was a very interesting breakfast meeting and it was to go on and I know it went on for a while. I don't know whether it is still going on. I really saw that as an important accomplishment.

So I came on at a time, I think, that P&P was really at a low point in terms of some of its reputation and certainly its struggle with issues and I think that by the time we left we had sort of been able to turn that around and to try to at least get back to the roots that, as we heard from Dr. Hilgard and the original charge of the committee, back to thinking about P&P being a long range deliberative sort of body.

Thank you.



(Applause)

DR. JACKSON: Dr. Garland Y. DeNelsky in 1989 was P&P chair.

(Applause)

DR. DeNELSKY: Some of what I'm going to say, of course, is going to repeat what Bob just said because we coincided for about two years.

I joined P&P during some most turbulent times. As already has been noted, the battle over reorganization, actually more of a civil war than a battle, was in full swing. Every item that was on the agenda, every issue that was considered by P&P ran the risk of swiftly being swept into this maelstrom.

There was virtually nothing on which the pro-organization forces and the anti-reorganization forces could agree except for one thing. Both seemed to be agreeing that there were too many boards and committees. The presumed wild proliferation of boards and committees was supposedly the reason for all the problems within APA, at least that's how the two groups could agree.

Although I had been in APA governance before, I really did not have the foggiest notion of how many boards and committees there actually were so I asked Nancy Forest, a most knowledgeable and helpful staff person, to find out. When she came up with the answer and it turned out to be somewhere in the 60s or so, not 100s and 100s, the turmoil only increased.

Furthermore, the ratio of committees and boards to APA membership had actually been decreasing over the past decade, not proliferating wildly as many had been insinuating. This fact, nicely documented, I believe, by the work of Al Barclay, seemed to make people even more worked up since there was a wide spread view that all boards and committees should be sunsetted, especially P&P. And a good bit of that came from within P&P. I won't mention a name but the person -- and he's not here today -- but had talked to me about one of his goals was to try to sunset P&P and he was on P&P at the time.

The anti-reorganization forces were especially anti-P&P since the earliest campaigns for reorganization had sprung from P&P and P&P was blamed for all this damn trouble that had been going on all these years because they had unleashed the forces of reorganization.

We all know, reorganization was defeated but there was no wild, widespread sunsetting of boards and committees. But APA was badly divided and there was a need for healing. This concept of healing became one of P&P's major concerns. P&P also tried to approach the board and committee problems from another perspective, encouraging and helping boards and committees to evaluate themselves and their roles and to work better with one another. As Bob Brown has just mentioned -- and he was very instrumental in this area -- it's hard to know where that has gone although if you look on today's Council agenda, there is going to be the possible sunsetting of one committee which seems to have outlived its usefulness.

P&P also struggled with conflict of interest guidelines precipitated by the conflict between some in APA and the National Register.

After the defeat of reorganization, there were dire predictions of widespread defections from APA. These predictions gained strength with the birth of the American Psychological Society, APS. APA was no longer the only national psychological association. There was competition in town. This meant that APA needed to market itself and actually recruit new members, a rather novel notion to many. It was felt that the Membership Committee was the appropriate group to do this. Amazingly, initially the committee felt that this idea was just too novel but with patient but persistent urging from P&P, a fullblown recruitment effort by APA was born. Perhaps partly as a consequence, APA has actually been gaining membership since the birth of APS. I think we needed competition and we thrive on it.

Perhaps the biggest item that P&P sank its teeth into was planning: long-range, strategic, any kind of planning at all. APA, like so many organizations, has seemingly been going from year to year reacting to problems, putting out fires but not planning. P&P saw a critical need to go back to its roots -- the roots that Dr. Hilgard and others have spoken of -- and do some planning and do it on a regular basis. While the board did not actually get it off the ground during my tenure, the seeds were sown which are now beginning to germinate. APA is becoming more planful.

My years on P&P were never boring and I personally was rewarded for my efforts by being elected to a fourth year provided, of course, that I would take major responsibility for authoring the five year history of APA, a required assignment of P&P. I later found many occasions to question my acceptance of this role although I suppose from the perspective of hindsight, it did build character.

The major conclusion of that five year report was that APA had gone through some of the most turbulent years in its recent history

and, as always, P&P was there. I really enjoyed my years on it.

Thank you.

(Applause)

DR. JACKSON: Gary's five year report was outstanding.

In 1990 Dr. Carol L. Lassen served P&P. Dr. Lassen.

(Applause)

DR. LASSEN: The most encouraging part of doing this whole exercise is to watch the curve of enjoyment versus conflict as you go through the years and to know that maybe 10 years from now, my perspective will be quite different -- and I don't know whether that's time or wisdom but I appreciate hearing from those of you who have been here for so long.

As has been mentioned by the two previous speakers, I think the main thing that was the influence on P&P and hopefully P&P's influence on the rest of the organization was because of the mood and atmosphere of the time. By that time, not only was there concern about APA and its existence but even central office was in such turmoil at that point. We had seen a change in executive officers which we can say now has certainly been a major point of turning and a positive one. But the staff was turning over a lot. There was a question of whether they were going to be paid from time to time. Along with all of the other plagues -- I don't know that there were locusts, but there were even floods in central office. So my year was the transition from Nancy to Sarah and lots of stuff going on, not only in the organization but in central office.

As Gary mentioned, the magnum opus of the five year report that he and other members of the committee accomplished really reflected the whole atmosphere and the beginning attempts at P&P to take a look at the mending process and to figure out where we might go from there and to focus on planning.

One of the things that came out of that emphasis or that focus on the efficiency of the committees and boards, if P&P was not to be sunsetted and some of the others and if less than one percent actually of the membership was represented in boards and committees was what we could do about something called efficiency in this organization. And so a couple of years prior to my year as chair, there was an establishment of about seven or eight areas of priority for P&P and with that, each time we would say, now, what was said about this three years ago? Now, what has happened to that particular issue?

And there were a few people with long memories and especially if they'd also been on Council and other boards, and so we begin to push and actually got in black and white -- thanks to Sarah

-- a flow chart of five year progression of different areas that P&P had acted on or attempted to make recommendations about and we would follow up on that. And I think that drove poor Sarah crazy that first year. It was really quite an effort on her part to go through all the old minutes and so forth and it was our attempt to pay attention to that whole issue of efficiency and continuity. And one of my first questions as I went through this in my series of what has happened to, I wonder what has happened to the flow chart and the sequence of events.

Then there was our attempt to take a look at the future, and we had a couple of retreats where we looked at trends and demographics and the change in technology and how that would impact psychology and how that would impact the people that we served in whatever role we are as psychologists and to take a look at models of planning. By the end of my year, we sent on a proposal to the Board of Directors to adopt some strategic planning approaches and we got a resounding response to them and an informal comment that they thought that P&P had lost their minds, and that was the end of the strategic planning concepts that we thought were kind of a good idea although there were some specific proposals, as has been mentioned, like around membership and around pushing some more around minority recruitment that seemed to bear further fruit.

The other thing that we did that seemed to be a little different and may have been the beginning of a precedent is we began to meet jointly with COLI on some big issues like the division guidelines, like the conflict of interest issues, and that seemed to be a very productive kind of effort and I'm hoping that that continues.

Then there was the whole issue of APAGS and then I have also wondered what's happened to APAGS and its relationship to APA since my year. What's happened to future focus, although it's interesting to me that Farley seems to have adopted his year as the year of the future, so maybe indirectly there was some impact in that regard.

Then there were the fun memories of both Sarah and Nancy. One of them I remember was, you know, in Colorado we have this

myth that we come down to sea level with more red blood cells and more oxygen in our system. I remember one of the hikes that we took during one of our retreats in which Nancy was way out ahead of those of us from Colorado and I decided that had to be a myth. And I certainly appreciated Sarah, with all the stuff about divisions and also taking on P&P in mid-year and what an effort that was given all the changes that were taking place in central office.

I certainly hope P&P goes on to be the think tank and indirectly, if not directly, having some influence, and maybe the influence has to be three and four years after our official proposals.

Thanks.

(Applause)

DR. JACKSON: Last year, 1991, Henry C. Ellis chaired P&P. Henry.

(Applause)

DR. ELLIS: Let me begin by telling you how I became a member of the Policy and Planning Board. In 1989 I finished my tour of duty on the Board of Directors. I had been on the Board of Directors during the most stressful time of the Association. The year 1988 was dreadful. I hated going to the Board meetings in many ways. Although I enjoyed my colleagues, the stress and the tensions was considerable and there seemed to be one crisis after the other. The National Register crisis, the budgeting finance crisis, the reorganization issue. It was one thing after the other.

And so as I completed my term, I looked forward to a period of a bit more relaxation and, as is custom, members of the Board of Directors are asked to select a particular board that they will go on afterwards. That is, they will go on a slate and they may or may not be elected. And I thought, gee, what would be a nice, congenial, pleasant group to work with? Something different from what I had experienced. And so I began to look around and it was clear to me that it was the Policy and Planning Board and so I asked to be put on that slate and I was promptly elected.

I might say that I went on this board with really one main issue that I wanted to talk about and that was the issue of membership. I had felt that the Association had completely neglected the issue of membership, that they had taken essentially a very limited stand on that. We received applications; we didn't recruit, we didn't do anything vigorous. And so that was one of my principle concerns.

During the time that I was chair, we dealt with -- we had moved on to dealing with a number of issues. In particular, we began to really try to come to grips with the issue of long-range planning. We had originally thought of this in terms of strategic planning but we shifted our thinking somewhat into trying to be proactive and thinking about issues that would be of long-range consequence to the Association.

(END TAPE 2, SIDE 1; BEGIN TAPE 2, SIDE 2.)

DR. ELLIS: -- the current leadership of Tom and Florence and so forth. The kinds of issues that we dealt with besides long-range planning issues, we dealt with the issue of the integrity of psychology as a discipline at our retreat. One of the issues that we decided to deal with was the whole problem of the balkanization of psychology, the splitting off. cognitive science, neuro science, etcetera and so on, and what was going to happen.

And we're in the process right now of trying to pull together a paper that we have a draft on in which we not only describe the problem, which has been ably described by a number of people, but rather to describe ways of dealing and addressing with this. And I, in a moment of foolishness or foolheartedness, proposed following our retreat that we assemble our thoughts, which were excellent thoughts, into position papers and I am still awaiting one more position paper and I told this individual I'll wait through the month of August and this person promises to have it. And at that time, those of you who are members of the Policy and Planning Board, we will begin to see something.

That issue, I think, is a major issue and I don't think there are any simple solutions.

We also dealt with what I will call housekeeping kinds of concerns which really reflect the organizational divisions within psychology. For example, representation on the Board of Directors. Brewster Smith raised the issue of whether we might consider some new way of electing members of the Board of Directors so that to ensure some balance and certainly having representation amongst science and science type interests in addition to practitioner interest.

The particular plan that was considered was decided not to be a feasible one. The issue was put on the back burner for the time

being. I'm sure that issue will come forth again in another form.

We also addressed the issue of liaison observers. That issue had been with us before. We had had that trial liaison. Policy and Planning Board and CSFC had been asked to address those issues. Policy and Planning Board recommended against the renewal of a liaison observer and CSFC, on the other hand, thought that we might try that again and, as I left the Policy and Planning Board, that issue was -- the split decision was presented to the Board of Directors and I had some communication with Charlie Spielberger on that but I don't know what final outcome is.

But those two issues again reflect the question of how do you have adequate representation of a variety of interests in a heterogeneous organization? We attempted to deal with the question of efficiency. We did introduce the idea of having self study reviews by all boards and committees, at least at the end of every five years. We dealt with some other issues including awards, bill of rights, and then some other sort of emergency policy issues. Overall, however, our concerns were long-range planning and the integrity of psychology as a discipline.

I might say that -- to refer briefly -- my initial motives on going on this committee to have a delightful group were fully satisfied. First, working with Sarah and with Nancy was simply a splendid experience. They're superbly talented individuals. The two finest individual staffers that I've worked with in APA.

And second, the committee was a model of congeniality, of civilized restraint in general -- Greg has now left us -- and a wonderful group. In fact, I often thought that this group could be a model for how the Association could work in many ways because, despite the diversity of interest and the representation, this was a group that respected each other, that worked carefully with each other, that genuinely like each other and tried to understand other points of view and, as a result, was an absolutely first rate group to work with. So it was my pleasure.

Thank you.

(Applause)

DR. JACKSON: From all that Henry reports, you'd think he was a slave driver. He wasn't.

Before we adjourn, we would like to hear very brief remarks from the current president and from the president-elect. Tom Oakland is the current president and Florence, would you follow him to the podium without further notice.

(Applause)

DR. OAKLAND: John, we want to thank you for organizing this delightful time today. We have discussed the pleasure that we've had among each of our Policy and Planning Boards but we haven't had an opportunity to see and experience that pleasure over years of time, over 30 or more years of time, and we have now sensed an affiliation that we have among the various boards and committees.

A successful P&P Board tries to identify the trajectories that previous boards established and when I came onboard, at which time John did, too, and others, we knew of the work that had preceded us, particularly that outlined by Bob and Gary, Carol and Henry. And so our task is to merely reaffirm the trajectories that the Policy and Planning Board had established for some time.

The three major issues -- and I'll identify those quickly. Long-range planning, and we're continuing that. The second would be division/APA relationships, another critical issue of long-standing. And the third would be seeking greater equity among the various sections within the American Psychological Association, particularly between science and practice.

Florence.

(Applause)

DR. DENMARK: I'll be very quick because I haven't yet been a chair, let alone a past chair. But I just want to repeat what was said. This is the greatest group within APA to work with and I can see that it would have been over the years, seeing the different people who were chairs, many of whom are personal friends of long time standing. So I'd say not only is there a Policy and Planning Board -- not that I planned to be on it, but it was nice to be nominated and to get on such a great group. But I was careful not to be in the position to have to write this five year report.

But everybody has been super and I want to say that when I become chair, I will carry on the work of my predecessors, particularly the ones that I have immediately followed: Tom and then before that Henry, who were there and in place when I came on the board. As was said, we've gone back to being a long-term planning body as well as things that get referred to us by Council or by the Board of

Directors. And I think that, personally speaking as a generalist, this is really the best board for dealing with all of psychology and I'm really proud to be part of it.

Thank you.

(Applause)

DR. JACKSON: The hour is late and I won't make my final statement. I had drafted something. Oh, you should have heard it. It would have equaled Webster's 7th of March address. But thank you for coming.

(Applause)

(Whereupon, the meeting was concluded.)

## THE POLICY AND PLANNING BOARD OF THE AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

THE Policy and Planning Board of the American Psychological Association is a deliberative body, concerned with consideration of the long-term policies of the Association and with planning for the advancement of psychology or for its contribution to human welfare in any way in which it is conceived that the Association might take part. The Policy and Planning Board has no executive powers except the power of recommendation to the Council of Representatives or to the Directors, but this power is likely to prove to be considerable since the Board, after due deliberation, takes the initiative, and such recommendations carry great weight. Presumably the Board may also make informal suggestions to committees or to individuals as to action, or it may propose deliberative cooperation of the committees or individuals with the Board.

Having only the power of recommendation, the Board does not usurp or interfere with the powers of the Council of Representatives and of the Directors, which are executive bodies and to which the Policy and Planning Board makes its recommendations. These executive bodies are not, of course, interdicted from deliberation, but experience shows that they are likely to be overwhelmed with a multitude of responsibilities and to lack time for careful deliberation. Both of these bodies will almost certainly welcome carefully formulated recommendations from the Policy and Planning Board, even though they may not always accept them.

Since deliberative committee planning is a special art, some of the basic principles have to be considered at the start. These principles are not new and have been utilized in various psychological conferences in the past. They have recently been given special significance by the success of R. M. Yerkes' Survey and Planning Committee, a subcommittee of the Emergency Committee of the National Research Council. The Survey and Planning Committee, which planned initially the present reorganization of the American Psychological Association, also planned the present Policy and Planning Board to be its successor, carrying on its function in the reorganized Association. Thus the old Committee

becomes a model for the present Board. Here are four principles which the new Board inherits from the Survey and Planning Committee.

1. Productive thinking requires freedom from distraction—in the committee as well as in the individual. Committee meetings that are held in conjunction with other meetings or in large cities where the committee members have other responsibilities or interests are apt to be disjointed. It is thus not to be expected that the Policy and Planning Board will do its most effective work at the time of the Association meetings, nor in New York or Washington or any other place where its members, having come for the Board meeting, will feel pressure to use the opportunity to do something other than the Board's business. The Survey and Planning Committee in the three years of its existence met nine times as the fortunate guests of the Training School at Vineland, New Jersey. In Vineland the Committee members were available for the Committee's business in the morning, afternoon and evening of every consecutive day. They came to the sessions on time and did not walk out for casual appointments with some colleague who was not on the Committee. They did their work and, when they got it done, they went home. They found sufficient recreation in seeing the Training School operate, in conversation and repartee, in walks and even on the children's see-saws, but no one was absent from a set meeting in order to go see-sawing.

2. The meetings of a deliberative committee need to be fairly long in order that initial errors may have time to correct themselves after consideration, that new insights may have time to emerge after sleep has reduced fatigue. The Survey and Planning Committee met for six days at its first meeting; thereafter for three days at each meeting. Sometimes the frustrations of counterargument and the confusion of verbal ambiguities would fill a second day, and then the whole matter would come clear to the group and agreement would form on the third day.

3. A deliberative committee also needs time in order to obtain a common language. Especially is that true when the members are chosen as represen-

tative of different fields, which are ordinarily in competition with each other for interest or favorable action. The emotional tensions that come to the sessions are enhanced by differences in the meanings of words and in the values that lie unconsciously beneath discussion. In a cooperative group working together for a long period, these differences are almost certain to disappear under the forces of socialization which occur with prolonged and intimate personal contact.

4. Almost everyone who participates in a personal cooperative group endeavor that ends in a seemingly successful achievement experiences euphoria. The spirit of the in-group forms. His respect for his colleagues is enhanced, and he finds himself believing in the work of his group. This sense of group membership is the reward that the members receive for their work and it is also the source of their motivation for more and more arduous labor. The danger that such a group may seek to perpetuate itself in order to exercise power can be offset by limiting its term of membership.

The Policy and Planning Board consists of nine members who serve each for three years. Their terms are staggered. The initial members are E. G. Boring, C. F. Jacobsen and R. Likert for one year; D. G. Marquis, L. F. Shaffer and L. N. Yepsen for two years; Marion Bills, E. R. Hilgard and Ruth S. Tolman for three years. Boring, Marquis and Hilgard carry over from the old Survey and Planning Committee and provide continuity with it. Boring was elected the first chairman.

The Board is intended to be representative of the range of varied interests which the Association includes. Its new members are elected annually by the Council of Representatives. While many advantages would be gained from a Board of long continuing membership, they would, in the opinion of the present Board, be offset by certain disadvantages. The membership of this Board ought to keep changing, so that new ideas and new habits of thought can be perpetually introduced. The Board's membership also ought to change in order that no fear of the continuing power of a closed group may arise. The new members should, moreover, be chosen with great care as to their representation of diversity, as to their ability, and as to their availability for this service, but the Board itself ought not to nominate its own new members. Perhaps the Directors or the

Committee on Committees should take this matter in hand. The present Board has voted and the Council of Representatives has approved the rule that no person can be nominated for two consecutive full terms on the Board.

The Board met at the business meeting of the Association at Columbus on December 27-29. It held five sessions of its own and met twice with the Council. It plans now to meet for five days on June 15-19 as guests of the North Jersey Training School at Totowa, New Jersey. This invitation was extended to the Board through the Department of Institutions of Agencies of the State of New Jersey. The Board also had an invitation from the Training School at Vineland, New Jersey, to continue there as the Survey and Planning Committee had done, but it proved impossible for the Board to arrange a date that was suitable at Vineland. It seems probable that a long June meeting will become standard practice, that the Board will also meet at the time of the Association meetings or immediately before them, and that ad interim discussion will be conducted by mail. Conventions of this sort have to grow up gradually.

The principal work of the Board at Columbus falls under six general headings and indicates what sort of topics are likely to come under the Board's surveillance.

1. The Board considered at great length its own procedures.

2. It discussed the question of the organization of the Association into Divisions, a matter that was causing a great deal of difficulty at that time, but it took no action because the initiative here lies with the Divisions themselves and no clear superior wisdom emerged. E. A. Doll, acting for the chairman of the Committee on Divisional Organization, met with the Board.

3. The Board also discussed at length the question of the control of public relations of the Association and of psychology, meeting with R. R. Sears and S. L. Pressey of the Committee on Public Relations, but the Board took no action because no recommendations seemed in order.

4. The Board did, nevertheless, consider the relation of the Association to legislation on the National Science Foundation. It studied the new Kilgore bill, recommended to the Council of Representatives that the Association endorse the bill and also the

Shapley-Urey letter concerning the principles which the Foundation should embody. In this case the Board acted quickly because it and the Council were in session. The Council accepted the recommendations. The Board could not, however, perform such an emergency function ad interim.

5. The Board of Directors had referred to the Policy and Planning Board the matters of the representation of the affiliated societies and of geographical representation, which were in the hands of a special committee. This committee reported to the Board, and J. G. Darley and G. J. Rich of the Committee met with the Board. The Committee and the Board revised the report, which was finally accepted by the Council of Representatives for submission to the Association as a new By-law entitled "State Associations and Their Representation." The Board also decided to leave the matter of representation by geographical regions without recommendation for change at the present time. This action presumably represents one of the important functions of the Board: the formulation of recommendations in a difficult controversial matter referred to it by the Directors or the Council. In this case, however, the greater part of the work had already been done by the special committee.

6. The Board also formulated a plan for the certification of professional psychologists, and the Council accepted its recommendation of an amendment to the By-laws to be submitted to the Association. The amendment requires the creation of an American

Board of Examiners in Professional Psychology, but the details of procedure are left to recommendation by a special committee and later by the Board of Examiners, if it is created. This action represents an action that originated within the Board after it had realized that the demands for membership in the Division of Clinical Psychology were so numerous that it was unlikely that membership in that Division could continue to be used as a kind of certification.

The Board is now planning agenda for its June meeting. Within three weeks after the Columbus meeting six topics had already been proposed for the Board's consideration: the relation of the Association to the National Research Council, the relation of the Association to the Psychological Corporation, the promotion of psychological techniques in the work of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the certification of graduate and professional training programs, the promotion of research in the psychology of leadership, the promotion of the writing of scientifically sound popular psychology. In the last named four of these activities the Association could conceivably play a role and the topics thus become proper agenda for the Policy and Planning Board. There is, however, no assurance at all that these particular topics will be considered in June. The Board will undoubtedly always have more business than it can undertake, for the simple reason that progress does not seem to approach the homeostasis of perfection.

Marion A. Bills  
Ernest R. Hilgard  
Carlyle F. Jacobsen  
Rensis Likert  
Donald G. Marquis  
Laurance F. Shaffer  
Ruth S. Tolman  
Lloyd N. Yepsen  
Edwin G. Boring, *Chairman*